
Lectotypification of Three Names in *Urtica* (Urticaceae)

Dmitry V. Geltman

Herbarium, Komarov Botanical Institute, Prof. Popov St. 2, St. Petersburg, 197376, Russia

ABSTRACT. Three names in *Urtica* described by A. Steudel are lectotypified: *U. pseudodioica*, *U. mollis*, and *U. bracteata*.

Steudel (1850) described several *Urtica* species from South America, using duplicates of the collections of Bertero. For some of these species he cited more than one specimen, and sometimes the syntypes appear to belong to different species; thus lectotypification is necessary.

Bertero specimens are present in many herbaria. By the same reasoning as that of Phillips et al. (1992) concerning holotypes, the names in question can only be lectotypified using the material from P, where the original Steudel material is now deposited (Stafleu & Cowan, 1985).

1. *Urtica pseudodioica* Steudel, Flora 33: 257. 1850. Lectotype, selected here: "Urtica dioica videtur diversa," ad sepes, secus vias Rancagua Chili, Bertero 737 (P).

There are at least three sets of specimens in the Bertero collection numbered 737. One of the specimens deposited at P is named "Urtica dioica videtur diversa," and is the specimen cited by Steudel in his description of *U. pseudodioica*. However, it is necessary to be extremely cautious in the recognition of isolectotypes in other herbaria, even if they are named "Urtica dioica videtur diversa." Such a sheet deposited at G belongs in fact to *U. magellanica* Poirlet, although the sheet at MO is indeed *U. pseudodioica*.

2. *Urtica mollis* Steudel, Flora 33: 258. 1850. Lectotype, selected here: In ruderalis, ad sepes in udis Quillota Chili, Bertero 1382 (P).

In describing this species, Steudel mentioned "Bertero hrbr. 1382 cum sequente mixta." With the next species, *U. bracteata*, he cited "Bertero nr 737 et 1383 ex parte." Indeed, one sheet of Bertero 1383 in P is marked "U. mollis" and has a "Type" label (the second Bertero 1382 is *Urtica berteroana* Philippi). Nevertheless, to avoid further misunderstanding I propose to follow the author's first choice in the protologue and to select as the lectotype Bertero 1382 (P).

3. *Urtica bracteata* Steudel, Flora 33: 258. 1850. Lectotype, selected here: Ad sepes secus vias Rancagua Chili, Bertero 737 (P).

This is a second sheet of the Bertero 737 set. The plant differs from the other sheet by its connate stipules. For details, see comments for the above species.

Extended taxonomic discussions are beyond the scope of the present paper, but some comments are necessary. In my opinion the names *U. mollis* and *U. pseudodioica* (following the lectotypifications here) are applied to the same species. Because both names were published in the same paper and have never previously been synonymized, I accept the name *U. mollis* and treat *U. pseudodioica* as its synonym.

The third sheet of Bertero 737 at P was identified by Steudel as *U. leptophylla* HBK and in fact belongs to *U. magellanica* Poirlet sensu lato. Apparently, this is the sheet taken into account by Navas (1961) as the type of *U. pseudodioica*, because she treated this taxon as closely related to *U. magellanica*.

As here defined *U. magellanica* sensu lato represents a complex of taxa. But the name *U. pseudodioica* cannot be included in this complex, because *U. mollis* and *U. magellanica* are distinct and probably belong to separate sections.

Urtica bracteata is closely related to *U. magellanica*, but differs in its connate stipules. Such plants occasionally can be found in *U. magellanica*, usually with free stipules. At the moment I prefer to treat this taxon as *U. magellanica* var. *bracteata* (Steudel) Weddell; I cannot agree with the suggestions of Navas (1961) to treat *U. bracteata* as a synonym of *U. dioica* L., a Eurasian species, which is more closely related to *U. mollis* than to *U. magellanica*.

Acknowledgments. Support for my studies on the taxonomy of South American *Urtica* species was provided by the Missouri Botanical Garden and is gratefully acknowledged. I am also grateful to the curators of P and G for sending specimens on loan. Finally, I thank Roy Gereau for review of the manuscript.

Literature Cited

- Navas, E. V. 1961. El género *Urtica* en Chile. Bol. Soc. Argent. Bot. 9: 395-413.
- Phillips, S. M., R. K. Brummitt & B. P. J. Molby. 1992. (201-204) Four proposals concerning types with duplicate specimens. Taxon 41: 770.
- Stafleu, F. A. & R. S. Cowan. 1985. Taxonomic Literature, 2nd ed., Vol. 5. Reg. Veg. 112: 1-1066.
- Steudel, E. G. 1850. *Urticeae* nondum descriptae. Flora 33: 257-261.